

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated January 31, 2007, claim 1 was rejected under §112, second paragraph as being indefinite because the Examiner stated the limitation “said examination images” in line 5 has insufficient antecedent basis. In response, claim 1 has been amended to use the term “said medical images” at that location, which is consistent with the use of that same term at numerous locations elsewhere in claim 1. Claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom are therefore submitted to be in full compliance with all provisions of §112.

Additionally, in the Office Action, the previously-made prior art rejections were maintained. Applicants are responding to those prior art rejections by renewing the appeal with respect to those prior art rejections that was previously filed. Accordingly, a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief are being filed simultaneously herewith.

Applicants note with appreciation the interview courteously afforded the undersigned representative of the Applicants on April 4, 2007, wherein the prosecution history, including the various amendments to claim 1, was discussed. It was agreed at the interview that amending claim 1 in the manner set forth above would overcome the objection to claim 1, and therefore that objection has not been addressed in the Appeal Brief that is being filed herewith.

Early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,



(Reg. 28,982)

---

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP

**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

Patent Department

6600 Sears Tower

233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312/258-5790

Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\4949664.1